

**State of South Dakota**  
**RFP# 1380**  
**Eligibility and Enrollment System**  
**Modernization**  
**State of South Dakota Response to All**  
**Vendor Questions**

Question No.	RFP Area	Section	Question Topic	Question	State Response
1	Introduction	1.1	Covered Programs	Will the State provide an inclusive list of programs and waivers included in-scope for this RFP under the term "Covered Programs"?	As discussed in section 1.1, Covered programs are listed as: the State's Medicaid, CHIP, Optional Supplemental Payment and End Stage Renal Programs. For Medicaid this includes the MAGI and NON-MAGI Populations. Details surrounding eligibility for all of these programs can be found on the DSS webpage: <a href="https://dss.sd.gov/medicaid/generalinfo/medicalprograms.aspx">https://dss.sd.gov/medicaid/generalinfo/medicalprograms.aspx</a> Additional information on the covered programs may be found at ARSD 67:46:01:02 . The link is <a href="http://sdlegislature.gov/Rules/DisplayRule.aspx?Rule=67:46:01:02">http://sdlegislature.gov/Rules/DisplayRule.aspx?Rule=67:46:01:02</a> . The State is also posting Exhibit 1 related to this question for additional detailed information regarding South Dakota eligibility categories.
2	Proposal Format	7.3.3.2	Reference to unknown section in RFP	RFP States: "...in the order listed, to the requirements set forth in Section 4 as described in 7.3.3.2.1 and 7.3.3.2.2. " The referenced sections do not appear to exist. Please clarify.	The original numbering was changed in final production of the RFP. The correct references are: "set forth in Section 4 as described in 7.3.3.3 and 7.3.3.4". The State will issue an Amendment to the RFP and correct this error.
3	General		RFP Documents	May we have the RFP in word and excel documents, to make generating our responses more efficient and accurate?	A word version of the RFP has been posted to the DSS RFP site at: <a href="https://dss.sd.gov/keyresources/rfp.aspx">https://dss.sd.gov/keyresources/rfp.aspx</a>

4	General		Submission	Is there a time deadline for submission of required elements during the course of the procurement?	The State expects all required pieces of the proposal to be submitted by the proposal submission date which is now October 9th, 2018 by 5pm Central time.
5	1.4 – Schedule of Activities	1.4	Proposal submission deadline	Can the state extend the submission date for responses by four weeks to October 15th, 2018	The State will extend the proposal submission date to Tuesday, October 09, 2018 5pm Central time zone.
6	4.4 – Project Initiation and Planning	4.4.1.4	Use of MS Project - The Master Project Plan...Service provider shall use Microsoft Project for this purpose and shall ensure that there are no resource conflicts under the proposed Master Project Schedule.	Please clarify if the state will permit for the use of web-based project management tools with functionality similar to Microsoft Project	The State will permit the use of web-based project management tools with functionality similar to MS Project as long as all necessary state and state contractor staff have access and are trained on the proposed tools AND as long as the tools produce the necessary reports needed to demonstrate progress or identify issues.
7	4.7 – Configuration and Development Activities	4.7.3.5	Attend design sessions, interface sessions, business process sessions and h sessions to assist the Service Provider to validate development that may be necessary to meet Government Requirements.	Please clarify the text “h sessions”	This clause should read as follows: 4.7.3.5 Attend design sessions, interface sessions, business process sessions and <i>data conversion</i> sessions to assist the Service Provider to validate development that may be necessary to meet Governmental Requirements. The State will correct this error in Amendment 1 to the RFP that will be released after all questions and answers have been reviewed.

8	4.9 – Testing Activities	4.9.3.9	Direct the Service Provider to evaluate the E&E System to production for pilot or for Statewide Go Live	<p>When referring to the system pilot, some places of the RFP appear to indicate a regional pilot as a mandatory phase, whereas other sections appear to indicate such a requirement will be at the discretion of the state.</p> <p>Please provide clarifications into the factors that will drive the decision. Additionally, please clarify if the state expects the prospective service providers to describe the approach to a pilot phase within the response submission.</p>	The State expects the Service Provider to describe how they have approached past implementations and whether or not they included a Pilot implementation. Your response should describe your approach to implementing a Pilot, if you are proposing as a best practice that South Dakota utilize a Pilot implementation.
9	4.10 – Training Activities	4.10.2.8	Service providers training responsibilities	Does DSS have a Learning Management System (LMS) to organize, track and report out regarding enrollments? Or other system to track which individuals' have participated in or completed training?	The State does not have an LMS system for EA training and we are NOT asking the Service Provider to provide LMS tracking system if they don't already have one in use in the other State(s) from which they are proposing the solution to South Dakota from. If needed, EA will track staff training attendance.

10	5.2 – Response Information	5.2.7	Describe and discuss its approach to training including the tools it proposes to use for this purpose and explain why it believes these tools to be appropriate. Each prospective service provider should also state whether it has used this methodology and these tools for another state that employed eligibility and enrollment functionality based on the same solution as the E&E System and if not, why it is proposing using a different methodology and different tools.	Are there specific training development tools currently licensed by DSS that must be used for this project?	No. The vendor is free to propose training development tools for this project.
11	6.3 – Financial Standing	6.3	Provision of three (3) years audited financial statements	<p>For very large private organizations, audited financial statements are not required by either state or federal statute.</p> <p>Will the State allow the service provider as part of its proposal:</p> <p>a. Uncertified financial statements for the last three years that demonstrates adequate financial resources for performance of the contract; and</p> <p>b. A certificate of authenticity which attests that the financial statements are correct in all material respects and is signed by an officer of the corporation, partner, or owner under penalty of unsworn falsification.</p>	The RFP required the submission of Audited Financial Statements. However, if unable to provide Audited Financial Statements, then describe what alternative actions you will take to support the accuracy of the financial statements you are able to provide.

12	6.4.2 – Third Party Security Audits	6.4.2	Provide the third-party security audits for similar projects that the prospective service provider listed above...	Please clarify if this information is to be included in the proposal given the NDA requirements by third parties / States and required State to State discussions.	The RFP will be amended to indicate submission of the third party security audits for similar projects will only be required of the top candidate/apparent winning service provider after the State has notified the service provider of our intent to award. It will not be required with the submission of the proposal. The State will sign an NDA with the apparent winning service provider to obtain this information. Service Providers should provide in their response a statement or statements indicating if they have had a third party security audit and if there were any findings requiring remediation of the proposed system.
13	7.3.3 – Detailed Response to Scope of Work	7.3.3.2	A specific point-by-point response, in the order listed, to the requirements set forth in Section 4 as described in 7.3.3.2.1 and 7.3.3.2.2. The response should identify each requirement being addressed as enumerated in the RFP. For purposes of Section 4 (Scope of Work), the prospective service provider must respond to each of the subsections and each section of a subsection and so on and so forth.	Please clarify the references to 7.3.3.2.1 and 7.3.3.2.2 as they do not exist in the RFP.	This is an error and will be corrected in the RFP Amendment #1. Please see the response to Question #2.

14	9.1 – Proposal Expectations	9.1	The State, with support from CMS, does not expect to pay any implementation charges for a system that already has been developed and is operational in another state beyond those costs associated with configuration for the State’s specific FPL levels, data conversion and interface development.	In order to perform a fit-gap against rules engine functionality to be leveraged from another State, Can the state share a summary of the various Medical assistance programs (MAGI, non-MAGI, CHIP and State specific programs), FPL thresholds and references to published State regulations	Please see the response to Question #1. The State has FPL information on the States website and is posting as a part of our response to questions an exhibit with more detailed information regarding which programs SD covers as a part of MAGI, Non-MAGI and CHIP.
15	4.2.1 and 5.3.4 – License Procurement	4.2.1  and 5.3.4	Service Provider shall enter into the Hosting Agreement on its own behalf and not as an agent for the State.  Supported by the Service Provider and hosted at the State or in a cloud tenant location of the State’s choosing and which the State manages and/or controls	The two referenced sections contradict each other in terms of hosting licenses.  Could you please confirm that the State is procuring cloud licenses from the Cloud provider as well as software licenses?	These clauses refer to different hosting arrangements and are not meant to be in conflict. In 4.2.1 - the language refers to bid options where the Service provider is proposing to host the solution on another State's or a service providers chosen third party vendor. In 5.3.4 - the clause refers <b>only to</b> the bid option where the service provider proposes to have BIT host the solution in SD. If you are proposing to have the solution hosted by the State (BIT) either at the State or in a cloud tenant location chosen by the State, the State will be responsible for cloud licensing and any associated cloud tenant software licensing.
16	9.7 – Miscellaneous Information that May Impact Pricing	9.7.4	Prospective service providers shall ensure that the E&E System will include, without additional charge to the State, fully paid-up licenses for the State to use all third-party software and other products required to run the E&E System.	Can the state provide an estimate of the number of users by user group for internal worker portal) and external (client portal) in each of the user groups	DSS expects internal users to number no more than 500. External (clients) we expect no more than 500 concurrent users in the Client Portal at any given time

17	Attachment K – Schedule D – Governance	26.2.2 page 261	Remediation Plans to address delays, hurdles and issues raised under Section 2.2.1.	Please provide section reference to the text “Error! Reference source not found”	Please see the WORD version of the RFP that was posted. Apparently during conversion to PDF, ERROR! Appears for any referenced section in the contract. For this particular item, the reference is to Section 2.2.1 of the contract - as it appears in the WORD version.
18	Attachment K-1 State of South Dakota – BIT IT Contract Provisions	12. Browser	The system, site, and/or application must be compatible with supported versions of Edge, Chrome, Safari, Firefox, and Internet Explorer browsers.	Will the State be open to discussing browser compatibility given the desire to leverage solutions successfully implemented in another State?	The State is open to discussing browser compatibility.
19	<b>1.13 Proprietary Information</b>	1.13 page 10	The RFP states “The Executive Summary must contain specific justification explaining why the information is to be protected.”	Given the 5 page limit for the executive summary we assume the justification language will be not be considered towards the page limit	Correct. The Justification language is NOT a part of the 5 page limit.
20	<b>6.4.6 Prior Projects</b>	6.4.6.8 and 6.4.6.10	Total price	Please clarify if the State means Initial contract value, lists of each contract amendment with amendment value, and lastly total contract value.	The State is interested in what it cost to implement the initial solution you are referencing as one that qualifies you to do the work in SD as a part of a response to RFP #1380. Service Providers should list what it cost (total cost) to implement the "similar" system you want SD to consider. If you were given amendments for additional scope of work beyond MAGI , CHIP and NON MAGI eligibility functionality, the Service provider may list out initial contract value and also list additional amendments with amendment value and that should show total contract value.
21	<b>6.4.6 Prior Projects and 6.4.7 Terminated Projects</b>	6.4.6.13 / 6.4.6.15 / 6.4.7.1 page 54	Past performance	Should the provider also list the projects where the provider solution has not met the Federal requirements (specifically ACF and or CMS) for a production system?	Yes. Indicate that your system has developed functionality for Optional programs and where you are at in getting federal approval.

22	<b>6.4.6 Prior Projects</b>	6.4.6.11	Changes to original project contract	Does the State expect the provider to list all the change requests in a table format along with the associated amendment? If so can the provider include that in an appendix?	Yes and Yes.
23	<b>6.4.7 Terminated Projects</b>	6.4.7.1	Clarification regarding "Any Similar"	Please clarify the context for "similar" is limited to Health and Human Services Integrated Eligibility Systems	South Dakota considers "similar" to mean of the same size and relative scope of an integrated eligibility system. This could include projects such as State Based Exchanges the Service provider has been involved with, any Federal level health and human services projects, State MMIS projects, or system solutions for State or Federal Public Health entities.
24	Attachment F	GT 10.10, 10.11, 10.12	PMO	Will there be a PMO who will take on some of the gate review reporting requirements that are in the RFP? We would want to make sure responsibilities do not overlap and could save time/money.	South Dakota intends to have a PMO office staffed by a contractor. South Dakota understands that it may be most efficient to have the PMO handle some of the Gate Review reports and documents. The Service Provider should indicate, based on experience, what MEET/MEECL documents it has available for leverage and re-use from previous implementations that could be leveraged to expedite the process in South Dakota and what role the State team, including PMO would play in finalizing these documents.
25	Scope of Work and Minimum Qualifications	4.11.4.6, 4.12.2, 5.1.5	Regions	How many regions does South Dakota have?	The Medicaid and CHIP programs are administered on a State-wide basis - not county or regionally based. The Division of Economic Assistance has defined "regions" for staffing purposes only. EA currently is organized as follows. We have 8 "Regions" for MAGI/CHIP and other "optional" programs for eligibility determination. We have 3 regions for Non-MAGI.



26	Functional Requirements	EFT and Other Banking Requirements	LTC Medicaid \$15	The South Dakota requirements indicate that EFT and Other Banking Requirements are only applicable to SNAP and TANF Programs. It appears however that there are payments made to Long Term Care recipients, and there are potential incentives awarded to people who participate in the Wellness program. How are those payments distributed to Medicaid recipients? Do the EFT and other Banking requirements also apply to the Long Term Care and Home and Community Based Waiver programs?	EFT and the ability to issue checks or warrants are required for the Non-MAGI program. The RFP will be amended to indicate that the Service Providers system must have the ability to issue a warrant or check to an individual or a facility and must have the ability to direct deposit payments into LTC recipient accounts. The State currently has no Wellness program.
27	Functional Requirements	INT	Requirement 45--- Requirement: The system shall have the ability to interface with IRS on a yearly basis or as needed to provide required 1095b information.	Question: There does not appear to be a CMS requirement to issue 1095 B for MAGI and Medicaid participants. What requirement is the State looking to address?	Until it is formally removed by CMS and South Dakota has confirmation, the requirement to produce 1095B forms and submit a full file of recipients to IRS on a yearly basis is an ACA requirement. That is why it appears in the RFP. Service Providers must indicate whether their solution can currently meet this requirement or if development would be needed. The State will work with CMS prior to final contracting and if possible, remove this requirement and ask for a Best and Final Offer from the Service Provider .

28	Functional Requirements	INT	Requirement 51 - Requirement: The system shall have the ability to interface with the Federal TBQ file and accept relevant information. TBQ is a daily batch data exchange between Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) and states. The TBQ file contains Medicare entitlement information.	Question: What are the specifications for this requirement?	This is a standard federal interface that is required. Please see: <a href="https://www.cms.gov/Medicare-Medicaid-Coordination/Medicare-and-Medicaid-Coordination/Medicare-Medicaid-Coordination-Office/Downloads/TBQData.pdf">https://www.cms.gov/Medicare-Medicaid-Coordination/Medicare-and-Medicaid-Coordination/Medicare-Medicaid-Coordination-Office/Downloads/TBQData.pdf</a>
29	Functional Requirements	INT	ALL	<p>When defining the interface requirements, the RFP uses the following phrases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• capability to interface</li> <li>• shall interface</li> <li>• should interface</li> <li>• should have the ability to interface</li> <li>• shall have the ability to interface.</li> </ul> <p>Can you clarify the meaning of each?</p> <p>Can you please clarify which of these interfaces are currently in place?</p>	The State is looking for what you have already developed for the other States as standard interfaces and there are several mandatory interfaces for Medicaid. Many of the interfaces listed in Attachment E are to support the Optional programs. The Medicaid Interfaces that must be developed if they don't exist in your solution are the following: INT #'s 1, 2,3,4 , 6,8,9, 12, 21, 22, 30, 32, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41,42,43, 49, 50, 51, 52.
30	1.1	Purpose and Contents, page 5	Requirements Modeling	Can South Dakota confirm if the requirements defined in the RFP are modeled after another State? If so, can South Dakota indicate the state they are modeled after?	The RFP requirements were not specifically modeled after another State. Requirements were pulled from multiple States RFPs readily available on CALT (now Zone) and the State reviewed and revised for SD specifics. The key point again is that we are willing to take the System you have , virtually "As Is" , customized only to meet SD State Plan , meet SD laws and remove or disable anything from your proposed solution that doesn't apply in SD (i.e. Managed Care Enrollment functionality) .

					Attachment E and F are meant to allow the State to pick the best fit for South Dakota by allowing us to see what your current system already has operational. With every requirement in Attachment E and F, indicate the appropriate response for your proposed systems capabilities. South Dakota is not looking for Development beyond interfaces, data conversion, cosmetic branding changes and as mentioned earlier items that must be configured or changed to meet South Dakota's State Plan, SD Laws, or functionality operational in another State that does not apply to South Dakota.
31	1.9.1	1.9.1, Submitting Proposals, page 9	Proposal Due Time	RFP Section 1.9.1, Submitting Proposals, states that, "All proposals must be received at DSS by the date and time indicated in....Section 1.4". Section 1.4 indicates a date, but not time. Can the State please identify the time cut-off?"	Proposals must be submitted by 5pm Central time on the Date specified in the RFP or as Amended by the State in any RFP amendments.
32	4	Statement of Work, Throughout	Business Hours	3 4 Statement of Work, Throughout Business Hours "Business hours" are frequently referenced (particularly with M&O requirements in section 4.12 and 4.13) but never explicitly defined. What do they consider business hours? Are they M-F, 7am-7pm CT (to align with system uptime from NFR GT 5.06)?	South Dakota spans two time zones - Central and Mountain. Business hours for South Dakota are M-F 7am Central through 7pm Central.
33	4.1	Provision of E&E System, Pg. 21	Benefit Recovery Process	Does the State currently manage the entire benefit recovery process (from overpayment determination to collection) for SNAP and TANF programs or is this handled by another vendor/third party?	The State currently handles the entire recovery process for SNAP and TANF

34	4.1.2.40.9	Statement of Work, page 20	Call Center Integration	Can the State provide additional detail around the expectations for call center integration? What types of interfaces/data would be required?	South Dakota currently handles customer interaction at the local office level with occasional assistance provided by the Central Office in Pierre. There is currently no call center to support the eligibility process and the State is not asking for a call center to be established as a part of this project. Accordingly, as an optional response, provide the State with any information surrounding your proposed solutions ability to integrate with a call center based on your current experience. The RFP will be amended to indicate that this is an optional informational requirement.
35	4.4.1.8	Project Initiation and Planning, page 25	Service Provider's Role in Stakeholder Communications Plan	<p>The RFP states, "Within thirty (30) days of the Effective Date, preparing and providing the State for its review and approval a detailed and comprehensive stakeholder communication plan, which will identify the specific State, Federal, contractor (e.g., PM and IV&amp;V contractors) and any other stakeholders who need information about the Project and the types of information each needs (the "Stakeholder Communications Plan"). The plan further will identify the timing, frequency, format and examples of content of stakeholder communications that can be expected throughout the project lifecycle"...</p> <p>What is the State's expectation of the Service Provider role in developing and delivering the communications needs identified in the Stakeholder Communications Plan?</p>	The State expects that all communications outlined in the plan would come directly from the State. The Service Provider will provide input and develop some of the communication but will require State review and approval. The State will release all communication to external stakeholders.

36	4.4. 1.13	Project Initiation and Planning, page 27	Expected Timeframe for Kick-off Meetings	7 4.4. 1.13 Project Initiation and Planning, page 27 Expected Timeframe for Kick-off Meetings Can the state confirm what is the expected timeframe for the kick-off meetings to occur from the "effective date"?	The State has an overall goal of implementing the solution no later than 21 months after project initiation. Service providers need to propose a realistic project plan and schedule that will accomplish this goal. The State expects the kickoff meetings to occur within the first 45 days of the project (45 days from contract signing and final CMS approval). Service providers can propose alternatives to this, but will need to explain in their proposal any timeline wherein the kickoff meetings occur later than State expectations.
37	4.5.1.4	Requirements Validation and Demonstration, page 29	Requirements Validation	This requirement states both "two months" and "three months" for requirements validation. Can you State please clarify if requirements gathering and validation should be completed in two months OR three months from the effective date?	The State has an overall goal of implementing the solution no later than 21 months after project initiation. Without knowing Service Provider approaches, the RFP lays out what the State believes will be necessary to complete what the State believes are the tasks/subtasks that move the project from Initiation to Implementation in 21 months. That said, the State expects that since we are asking to use an already existing system, virtually "as is", that requirements validation can be completed in the first 3 months of the project. Service providers need to propose a realistic project plan and schedule that uses their SDLC and approach to this project and still accomplishes the goal of implementing the solution within 21 months. Provide an explanation in your proposal for any deviation from what the State expected in the RFP.

38	4.8.1.1.1	Data Conversion and Migration, page 32	Data Conversion of Source Systems	Does the state require the conversion of data from any other source system other than ACCESS for the "covered programs"? If so, please specify the system(s) and data contained.	MAGI Medicaid data is stored in the ACCESS System. Non-MAGI Medicaid eligibility data is stored in the SS-09 system which is another part of the Legacy Mainframe that has very limited data elements. The State's PMI record for every recipient is also contained on the mainframe. Data Conversion would be from all of these systems.
39	4.9	4.9.1.5 Testing Activities - Service Provider page 35	Deficiency Testing	<p>The RFP states, "Providing and promptly sharing with the State an impact assessment for all Deficiencies identified by the State or Service Provider during each test (including unit, system, integration, stress, regression and UAT). The impact assessment will detail what each Deficiency is, what modules or components it affects, how it impacts the business process flows, components, interfaces, etc. The Service Provider will also provide the State a timeline for fixing each Deficiency. If a work-around is available to continue valid testing, and is reasonably acceptable to the State, the Service Provider will train the State team on such work-arounds"</p> <p>The section specifically calls for the service provider to provide an impact assessment for all deficiencies found during testing, including unit, system, and stress testing deficiencies. Furthermore the section states the service provider will provide timelines for fixing and work-arounds. Neither of these are typically provided for unit, system, or stress testing phase deficiencies; rather summary reports of deficiency findings/overall results are typically provided. May the service provider</p>	Yes, the Service Provider can consider this requirement only applicable to Stress testing, Integration, Regression and UAT deficiencies.

				specifically consider this section applicable only for Integration, Regression, and UAT deficiencies?	
40	4.10.1.1	Training Activities, page 36	UAT	What is the maximum number of individuals anticipated for UAT? Of those individuals, will any be experienced trainers?	The State anticipates a team of no more than 25 for initial UAT. At least 8 of those staff will be experienced trainers. As the State adds or rotates staff in to assist, the State will train any additional UAT testers after initial training.

41	4.10.1.2	Training Activities, page 36	Training Timeline	Please clarify how 60 days was determined, and if it is calendar days or business days. Can this timeframe be adjusted based on completion of the overall training plan and project schedule?	It is meant to cover 60 calendar days. Again, the RFP contains the preferred timeline. The Service Provider can propose an alternative as a part of their overall project plan and schedule and explain why there is a variance between the RFP and how you proposed to do the work.
42	4.10.2.8	Training Activities, page 36	Learning Management System (LMS)	What Learning Management System (LMS) is used by the State? Please clarify if there is a training publishing software used by the State (e.g., Captivate, Articulate, Lectora) and if so can these tools be utilized by the Service Provider?	No, the State does not have an LMS system that can be leveraged. Service providers should propose use of their current system/solutions they have used in the other states.
43	4.10.0	Training Activities, page 36	Trainee Groups	<p>The RFP states, "Moving to a modern solution will require significant training and re-orientation for not only EA staff, but other State stakeholders including customers, contractors, and personnel in other DSS divisions (each a "Trainee Group")"</p> <p>Please classify each trainee group by State employed vs. external and the approximate size of each group.</p>	The following are the perceived training groups and estimated size: Internal users at the State: 500, No external stakeholders. Training for Customers will be computer based or provided by trained EA staff on how to use the Portal. There are currently over 125,000 recipients.
44	4.11	Pre-Go Live Activities, page 37	Primary Training Methodologies	What are the primary methodologies of training delivery in use today at DSS for ACCESS training and policy training?	ACCESS Training is delivered in person in Pierre at set intervals throughout the year with an instructor over the course of approximately three days. There are formal training books, desk guides, etc. That are provided and the training culminates in completion of a series of tests demonstrating students have learned how to use the system or new function within the system. Policy training is done using Adobe Captivate modules that are accessed and utilized by staff at their desks. Supplemental instruction is provided by each staff's



					supervisor and via reading the EA policy manual.
45	4.11.2.4.6	Pre-Go Live Activities, page 38	Pilot Approach	In order for the State to conduct a robust pilot and compare vendor proposals, can the State consider further clarifying the term "pilot."? If the State intends for the pilot to be a "live pilot" as opposed to a "parallel pilot," can the State explicitly state this expectation? Additionally, can the State consider adding minimum pilot duration of at least two (2) months? This will help make sure the State is comparing similar proposals with a robust pilot approach.	Please see the answer to question #8. To be clear, the Pilot is an optional phase and the State may not ask for a Pilot of the system based upon the overall DDI experience and specifically the States confidence in the solution after UAT. The Pilot is meant to be a live pilot as the States Legacy system has extremely limited automation, making a parallel pilot virtually impossible.
46	4.12.1	Post - Implementation Activities/Hypercare and Warranty, page 40	Hypercare/Warranty Period	RFP, Section 4.12.1 calls out the Hypercare and Warranty period as 6 months (or the date when all material defects are resolved) but then in section 4.12.2, when referring to region specific go lives, the duration is specified as 3 months (or the date when all material defects are resolved). Please clarify if the hypercare/warranty period is 6 months or 3 months.	The language in 4.12.1 is correct. Hypercare/Warranty period ends on the latter of six full calendar months OR the date all material deficiencies have been remediated and successfully tested without giving rise to other deficiencies. Section 4.12.2 will be corrected in Amendment #1.
47	4.13.2.1	Maintenance and Operation Activities, page 43	First Level Support	Can the State share additional details on its current first level support function, the methodology, processes and governance structure? Also, please provide detail regarding resourcing level.	The State does not have anything like the first level support function listed in the RFP. EA currently has a position similar to what is in the RFP to provide first level response, problem solving, and support for EA staff using the ACCESS system. The EA help desk is staffed by a single person who can call BIT as needed to report system defects and problems.

48	4.13.2.1.3	Maintenance and Operation Activities, page 43	Online Chat Support	Does the State currently use any online chat tool to provide real time support to its Authorized Service Users to help with incidents? If so, please provide the name of the product. Can this product be reused for fulfill this requirement?	There is currently no online chat function in use by the State.
49	4.13.2.1.6	Maintenance and Operation Activities, page 43	Application Lifecycle Management Software	Does the State currently use any incident management or application lifecycle management (ALM) software to support its applications? If so, please provide the name(s) of the product(s). Can these products be reused for fulfill this requirement?	The State does not have an ALM solution that can be used to fulfill this requirement.
50	4.13.2.1.6	Maintenance and Operation Activities, page 43	Application Lifecycle Management Stool	<p>Is the state asking for the service provider to recommend and/or implement an ALM Incident Management Tool as part of the RFP?</p> <p>4.13.2.1.14 Maintain the Second-Level Help Desk infrastructure (including hardware, software and networking equipment and software) as required to perform the Second Level Help Desk Services in accordance with the Key Performance Indicators and Service Levels; and</p> <p>4.13.3.6 Provide the State with a production version of the defect tracking system.</p>	The State does not have an ALM solution that can be used to fulfill this requirement. Service provider should address this in their proposal.
51	5.2.1	Response Information, page 47	Infrastructure Approval Timeline	What is the timeline for the approval of the Infrastructure/hardware/software components proposed by the service provider?	Timeline will depend on the requirements of the proposed solution and if additional information is needed.

52	5.2.25	Response Information, page 49	Staffing Plan	Can the state provide more detail on what content it expects in the initial draft of the staffing plan?	The initial draft of the Staffing plan should include the core areas of a resource management plan as discussed in the Project Management Book of Knowledge (PMBOK). The State expects at a minimum that the Service provider will provide: Project Organization Chart showing all staff who will be a part of the project, who they report to, where they are located and whether they are going to be involved full time from project initiation through implementation or if they are Subject matter experts supporting on an as needed basis. The narrative should explain what each person will be doing, their qualifications, whether they are key staff or not and should indicate any % of onsite presence in South Dakota. Service Providers should leverage staffing plans from similar engagements for re-use (format wise) in South Dakota.
53	7.3	Proposal Organization, page 55	Proposal Organization	<p>The RFP states, "All Technical proposals are required to be organized and tabbed with labels for the following sections and headings (noted in bold) and contain:..."</p> <p>Is it the State's intent that our response sections should be numbered the same as the RFP (e.g., 7.3.1, RFP Form, 7.3.2, Executive Summary); or, is it acceptable to number in a logical and sequential fashion starting with Section 1, RFP Form (with references to the 7.3 numbering)?</p>	Service providers should number in logical sequential order with reference to the RFP section.

54	7.3.3.2	A specific point-by-point response, page 55	Proposal Organization	<p>The RFP states, "in the order listed, to the requirements set forth in Section 4 as described in 7.3.3.2.1 and 7.3.3.2.2...."</p> <p>We have assumed that the references 7.3.3.2.1 and 7.3.3.2.2 should be 7.3.3.3. and 7.3.3.4. Is this a correct assumption?</p>	Your assumption is correct. Please see the response to question #2.
55	7.3.3.3	E&E System Requirements, page 55	Proposal Organization	<p>The RFP states, "With respect to Section 4.1, the prospective service providers are required to address the requirements for the E&amp;E System as they relate to the Covered Programs, and are encouraged but not required to address such requirements as they relate to the Optional Programs. Prospective service providers must also review and respond to each of the Functional and Non-Functional Requirements for the Covered Programs in Attachments E and F, and are encouraged, but not required, to review and respond to such requirements for the Optional Programs. Each prospective service provider should indicate the appropriate capability for each requirement and also provide a brief description of how its solution meets or could meet the requirement listed (200-page limit total for the two attachments)."</p> <p>We assume that the 200-page limit is for Attachments E and F only, and not inclusive of the written response to RFP Section 4.1 that precedes the attachment responses. Is that a correct assumption?</p>	Correct, the 200 page limit is for Attachments E & F only.

56	7.4	Minimum Qualifications to Bid, Response Requirements and Bid Options, page 56	Proposal Organization	<p>The RFP states, "Prospective service providers must respond to each subsection of Section 5.0, providing the requested information. Prospective service providers should acknowledge sections that don't explicitly ask the prospective service provider to provide a response or discuss previous experience. (30-page limit excluding financial statements)."</p> <p>All requirements in RFP Section 5.0 appears to contain information that is duplicative of other response sections. In addition, the financial statements are not one of the requirements in this RFP section. Is the 30-page limit meant for this section, or our response to RFP Section 7.6, Proposal Requirements and Company Qualifications.</p>	The 30 page limit applies to Service Provider response to Section 5.0. Section 7.6 requires Service provider to address everything in section 6.0 and does not have a page limit, however the State encourages an economical presentation for your response to items in Section 6.0 to facilitate efficient review and evaluation.
57					Intentionally left blank.
58	Attachment E, Functional Requirements Table	INT-22	Interface	Please confirm that this interface applies to MAGI and Medicaid. If so, please provide more detail on what financial benefits are issued for MAGI and Medicaid.	Interface 22 requires the system to interface with banks and the State accounting system. For this RFP, specifically the Covered Programs, this requirement applies to the Optional Supplement Program (this is necessary to process the monthly 15\$ payments to recipients), "regular assisted living" and

					adult foster care programs that are a part of Non-MAGI program. These are optional State supplements under 42 CFR 425.232 and are considered Non-MAGI eligibility groups in South Dakota. These are programs where payments are made.
59	Proposal Organization	7.3.3.2	Proposal Organization	RFP States: "...in the order listed, to the requirements set forth in Section 4 as described in 7.3.3.2.1 and 7.3.3.2.2. " The referenced sections do not appear to exist. Will the State please clarify the instructions?	This is an error and will be corrected in the RFP Amendment #1. Please see the response to Question #2.
60	Attachment K	Section 9	Missing References	There are at least two instances where "Error! Reference source not found." occurs. Will the State please update these references? [9.2.1 page 215; 10.4.2 page 218, for example)	This is a problem that occurred in the transition from WORD format to PDF. It is only in the PDF version of the RFP. Please review the WORD version and you will find the references. For example, the reference in 10.4.2 on page 218 clearly says "under Section 5.4.3" in the Word version of the document.
61	Data Conversion and Migration	4.8	Data Conversion/Data Migration	What types and quantity of unstructured data are present in the existing SD dataset? i.e. CLOB, .pdf, .docx, etc.	All data is structured ADABAS\VSAM files.
62	Functional Requirements - Reporting and Business Intelligence	RBI-2	Reporting and Analytics	What reports and programs are included in the Federal Report set?	For this RFP, it would be all Federal Reports required for the Covered Programs (Medicaid and CHIP programs) both MAGI and Non-MAGI related. The SEDS report and the CMS performance indicators are the current federal reports for DSS, Service providers should propose whatever reports they have created for their "As Is" system being proposed to South Dakota. If the Service provider has reports already created in another state for the Optional Programs (SNAP, TANF, Child Care, LIEAP), please state that in the response for

					informational purposes.
63	Nonfunctional Requirements	CON-7	Conversion	What is the current cumulative size of the existing SD dataset needed for this implementation? Are there any capacity planning calculations that can be shared?	Please see information on the number of cases and recipients as listed in the RFP. Our Medicaid population is extremely small - 125,000 recipients and we are not asking for more than current active cases to be converted. Once we know what data elements you need to have your system operational, we will be able to determine how much of our Data set is relevant for Conversion. We are unable to provide the cumulative size of the entire existing dataset at this time.
64	Nonfunctional Requirements	GT-4.02	Security	What is the Specific Type of Biometric security for this implementation	Requirements in Attachments E and F are what the State will use as a means to select the best solution ("As Is") that meets South Dakota current and future requirements. We are not asking for development of biometric security to be developed as we are taking your solution - "As Is". Service Provider should explain what current functionality their proposed system has with regard to integrating with any biometric security in place in other states. Do not propose any development effort for this item. DSS and BIT have no preference on any proposed biometric security capabilities proposed by service providers.

65	Functional Requirements	EDM-2; EDM-3	Scanners	Requirements EDM 2& 3 mention scanning documents and attaching. Are scanners and/or scanning software expected as part of this proposal to capture documents? Are high volume scanners required?	The State is requesting that service providers to propose a document management solution that is integrated with the E&E system. The State will have some documents that will need to be scanned and attached to case files in the new system. The State assumes what you consider "high volume" is for States with significant Medicaid populations. Please keep in mind South Dakota has less than 125,000 recipients in Medicaid. The State needs to be able to efficiently scan, process and store paper documents that need to be a part of the case file. The State is not looking for Service providers to propose hardware (scanners) for States use. We assume Service providers will have integrated software for scanning as a part of their product that current scanning equipment in SD can be integrated with.
66	Functional Requirements	Reporting and BI	Reporting and Analytics	Will the state please provide the complete list of reports by program it is expecting with examples? This will assist with appropriate scoping and sizing.	This RFP is based on the concept that we will be re-using another States solution that you have already created and have operational. Attachment E shows what requirements the State is looking for and one of the factors the State will review is how closely (based on how you answered Attachment E) your solution meets what we believe we need. The legacy solution has limited reporting and no business analytics capabilities. The Service Provider should answer the requirements in Attachment E based on their best matching system to what the State is looking for. The State will take the reports you can already produce (for your other States) as our starting point for reporting and assuming you have



					reports already developed for another State that meet CMS requirements for MAGI and NON MAGI and CHIP reporting, limited if any development will be done beyond adhoc report creation by the State team once the Service provider has trained the State.
67	Data Conversion and Migration	4.8.1.1.1	Data Conversion and Migration	The RFP mentions converting additional data that is required to support each program. Please provide more details on the type of data that would be coming from that legacy system.	For clarification for the Covered programs, the State has no “additional data “to be converted. State assumes that the Service provider will give the State the list of data elements required by the system and the BIT team will work to extract the appropriate data for each recipient. All data from the legacy system will be coming from structured database files.
68	Data Conversion and Migration	4.8.1.1.1	Data Conversion and Migration	What are the monthly application and case maintenance volumes on the system?	South Dakota processes between 2,000 and 3,000 new Medicaid applications each month and have roughly 68,000 Medicaid Cases covering 122,000 distinct individuals in an average month. South Dakota reviews cases that have been eligible for at least 12 months on a monthly basis as a part of the Renewal process. We do not have exact numbers on renewals per month at this time.

69	Functional Requirements	Reporting and BI	Reporting and Analytics	How many reporting analytic users of each type will there be in the new solution? User types can be classified in one of two ways: Executive and Business Analyst. Executive users may use dashboards and pre-defined summary reports to monitor KPI's and quickly spot trends. Business Analysts use report authoring tools to create standard and ad hoc reports as well as dashboards for use by others.	Using your definitions of user types, South Dakota anticipates: Executive Users: 10, BA's: 10.
70	Functional Requirements	WP	Work Programs - MAGI	Can the state expand on their work program requirements for MAGI? Is this required functionality for the mandatory programs?	South Dakota has filed an 1115 Waiver to implement work requirements for certain Medicaid recipients. The program is called Career Connector. The new solution should support work requirement functionality, however as stated in the RFP we are taking the solution provided - "as is". Please tell the State what functionality you have available in your proposed solution. The State description of Work Requirements are found in the 1115 waiver and on the DSS website at <a href="http://Dss.sd.gov">Dss.sd.gov</a> . For this RFP, work requirements apply to a subset of the MAGI population.
71	Attachment K	5.4.2	Flow Down Requirements	Service Provider should have the flexibility to manage its subcontractors as it believes appropriate to its business arrangements. The State's contractual relationship is exclusively with the Service Provider. Therefore, would the State consider removing the requirement that the Service Providers' subcontractors must agree to specific portions of the prime contract – e.g. Sections 10, 12, 14 and 15?	Service providers can manage subcontractors however they like, however these clauses must apply to all subcontractors. The State does not agree that subcontractors are not required to meet the clauses in 10 (confidentiality of data), 12(Retention and Inspection of records), 14 (Representation and Warranties), and 15 (Indemnification). It is correct that we don't expect a contract with each of your subcontractors however we do expect any contract that the Service Provider has with the Subcontractor

					include these clauses and yes, the Service Provider is ultimately responsible for all work.
72	Requirements Validation with Demonstration	4.5.1.5	Requirements	<p>The RFP states “...Service Provider shall configure Service Provider’s solution for consistency with the then-current South Dakota-specific rules...”. In what form do the current South Dakota-specific rules exist? Are they currently all coded in the system or available in a document of some kind or a collection of policies? There will be a level of effort required not just to identify those rules that are different, but also to confirm the rules that are the same. If available, will the State please provide a list of rules? If not available, will the analysis then be the responsibility of the State?</p>	<p>South Dakota business rules are not automated in the Legacy system. The State manually, using an excel spreadsheet, determines eligibility. The ACCESS System has limited automation for MAGI and none for NON-MAGI eligibility determination. MAGI rules are the same nationwide, so we don't expect there to be a vast difference, beyond FPL levels and coverage groups between what your system has and what South Dakota needs. For Non-MAGI, South Dakota's rules are contained in Chapter 67:46 of South Dakota Administrative Rules. We will be taking your system virtually "as is" with configuration and what we believe will be minor development effort. "Minor policy differences that are within a state's discretion and don't violate any SD statute or rule will be adopted by the State. Again, it is our intent to use the system as close to as-is as possible." We will work with the Service Provider during requirements validation to jointly identify the policy differences.</p>

73	Selection	8.3	Cost Factor	In order to understand the appropriate fit with existing transfer solutions, could we obtain a more detail view of the existing architecture, system software and hardware for the state of South Dakota?	The Legacy system is discussed in Section 3 of the RFP. It is a mainframe solution that serves as a data capture system and it has limited automation. Due to security concerns detailed information will only be shared with selected vendor. ACCESS is a mainframe system using structured ADABAS\VSAM files.
74	Future Phases	4.2.3.2	Optional Programs	We understand that the state will not initiate future phases until there has been a full statewide roll out of the program(s) provided in any previous phase, but when would the state expect to make the decision to include the Optional Programs?	The State will closely monitor the overall implementation of the Medicaid solution. If the implementation goes smoothly with minor issues and we receive CMS approval/certification, the State will then review the possibility of implementing 1 or more of the Optional programs and will work with the Service Provider to finalize the DDI costs and appropriate timeline for such an implementation.
75	Backgrounds	3.2.1	Medical Assistance Coverage Types	Could the State please provide a comprehensive list of the medical assistance coverage types?	Please see response to question #1. We are posting Exhibit 1 as a part of the States response to the vendor questions
76	General Information	1.14	Length of Contract	The total initial contract length will be approximately six years from contract execution. The Summary cost proposal reflects an implementation period plus six years of Maintenance and Operations. Will the State please clarify that the six years begins at the end of the implementation period (which will be no longer than 21 months)?	As planned, the base contract is 6 total State fiscal years with two option years after that for renewal. The Implementation period is estimated to be 21 months - leaving approximately 51 months in the base contract or 4.25 years for M&O. The State is looking for costs for both the 6 total year base contract AND an initial estimated of costs for the 2 possible extension years. South Dakota will designate Year 1 of the contract to run from May 2019 through May 31, 2020. This will be followed by 5 additional base years ending in May 31, 2025.

77	Nonfunctional Requirements	GT-4.04	Single Sign-On (SSO)	What IDP system does the State utilize to provide SSO to its users?	The State uses Azure B2C.
78	Nonfunctional Requirements	Non Functional Requirements	Availability including Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery (BC-DR)	Having an RTO for 4 hours will cause additional unnecessary costs to the solution. Would the state be willing to entertain other reasonable recommendations concerning this disaster recovery metric?	The State will entertain other reasonable proposals that are akin to what you are providing for other State customers. Propose your standard approach and the State will consider during evaluation and contract negotiation.
79	Nonfunctional Requirements	GT-5.19	Availability including Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery (BC-DR)	Availability including Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery (BC-DR)	The State is unclear of what the question is. It appears to be a copy/paste error.
80	Nonfunctional Requirements	GT-7.03	Availability of interface format and throughput requirements	Please provide the name, description, format/endpoint type, frequency, inbound/outbound direction, packet/message size, and peak/average volume corresponding to the internal and external interfaces.	This information is unavailable at this time.
81	Proposal Organization	7.3.3.3	Proposal Format	Instructions in this section indicate a 200 page limit total for the two attachments (Attachments E and F). Is there a page limit assigned to section 4.1? (The narrative section associated with Attachments E and F.)	There is no page limit for the response to section 4.1, however service providers are advised to make their response as economical as possible to facilitate efficient proposal evaluation.
82	Financial Standing	6	Audited Financial Statements	RFP Requires: Each prospective service provider is required to submit a copy of their most recent three (3) years of audited financial statements as a part of this solicitation to demonstrate strong financial standing and ability to deliver the requested products and services to the State. Please ensure that audited financial statements clearly include the health and human services sector or organizational area under which this Project would be conducted. In lieu of hard copies, will the State	As a part of Amendment #1, the State will allow a link to corporate financials in lieu of hard copies. We have also updated other components of the Financial Statement requirements as a part of Amendment #1.

				accept a link to our corporate financials?	
83	1.0 General Information	1.1 Purpose and Contents, page 4	Additional Information	<p>From the RFP: "The State may reward proposals (i.e., assign higher technical scores) that provide a solution that supports the Covered Programs, the Optional Programs and other DSS Programs even though the State is making no commitment to use the E&amp;E System for, and is not contracting for Services related to, the Optional Programs and other DSS Programs, at this time."</p> <p>Which Optional and DSS programs would the State be most interested to include in this contract award at a future state in order of importance and likelihood of inclusion?</p>	The State will let the Service provider propose which programs are the most logical choices to follow the Medicaid Implementation. SNAP would be the next largest program to implement and that may or may not make the most sense to target as the first Optional program to bring into the new system. TANF, Child Care and LIEAP are much smaller programs. Service Providers should propose, based on the maturity of their proposed systems, which order they believe would be the most logical and provide which if any Optional programs can be combined in a subsequent phase after Medicaid.
84	1.0 General Information	1.9, Submitting Proposals Page 9	Clarification	Is there a size limit to the final response files that are required to be uploaded to the FTP site?	There is no technical size limit for the FTP site.

85	1.0 General Information	1.13, Proprietary Information Page 10	Clarification	<p>From the RFP, “Each prospective service providers must clearly identify in its Executive Summary and mark in the body of the proposal any specific proprietary information they are requesting to be protected. The Executive Summary must contain specific justification explaining why the information is to be protected.” Can bidders submit a redacted electronic copy to the FTP site along with the original copy? Also, would the State allow the specific justification regarding exemption from public disclosure in the Executive Summary be excluded from the page count limit?</p>	<p>The State will allow Service providers to submit a redacted electronic copy of the proposal along with a full proposal to the FTP site. The Justification piece for why it should be exempt from public disclosure does NOT count as a part of the Executive Summary Page limit count. Service Providers can redact proprietary information as discussed in SDCL 1-27-1.6.</p>
86	1.0 General Information	Section 1.1 Page 5	Clarification	<p>State indicates that it “anticipates that portions of this RFP (including Section 4.0 and Attachments E&amp;F) ...will function as the SOW included in the Agreement.” What other provisions of the RFP, in addition to Section 4.0 and attachments E&amp;F will make up the SOW?</p>	<p>It is anticipated that the Agreement will include anything from service provider response to RFP sections 4.0, 5.0 and 6.0, 7.0 and 9.0 will be a part of the agreement. Along with Attachments K an K-1 (Contract)</p>
87	1.0 General Information	Section 1.1 Page 4	Clarification	<p>Understanding Service Providers are to enable State to qualify for the Maximum Federal Financial Participation from CMS, can the State please advise as specific requirements that pertain to the E&amp;E solution to meet this qualification?</p>	<p>Please Review the CMS Guidelines for enhanced FFP as discussed in CMS documents:  <a href="https://www.medicaid.gov/State-Resource-Center/FAQ-Medicaid-and-CHIP-Affordable-Care-Act-Implementation/Downloads/FAQs-by-Topic-75-25-Eligibility-Systems.pdf">https://www.medicaid.gov/State-Resource-Center/FAQ-Medicaid-and-CHIP-Affordable-Care-Act-Implementation/Downloads/FAQs-by-Topic-75-25-Eligibility-Systems.pdf</a> (for operations phase) and  <a href="https://www.medicaid.gov/federal-policy-guidance/downloads/smd16004.pdf">https://www.medicaid.gov/federal-policy-guidance/downloads/smd16004.pdf</a> for DDI phase.</p>

88	1.0 General Information	1.5 Page 7	Clarification	<p>Section 1.5 indicates that the State underwent extensive due diligence regarding E&amp;E solutions. Can the State please indicate the timeline of such diligence and what specific methods were used to obtain information that has resulted in the current RFP?</p>	<p>The State began its research and due diligence regarding how to best modernize their eligibility system in late 2014. An invitation to demonstrate and discuss was posted on the DSS website for any and all vendors to see. The IDD requested background information on each vendor solution and invited vendors to Pierre to discuss the States goals and objectives as well as allow the vendors to demonstrate their latest versions of the Integrated eligibility systems to give South Dakota a sense of what functionality was available. Following the Demonstrations, South Dakota followed up with all vendors asking for hypothetical pricing information for a solution that is much like you see in this RFP - an already operational system that SD could use "As IS" for the most part. Concurrently South Dakota Surveyed approximately 15 States to see if they would be interested in a State to State Agreement without having to Procure a solution. As a result of that exercise, much of 2015 and 2016 was spent exploring several states options to share with State to State meetings, brokered by both FNS and CMS occurring to discussing feasibility. It was determined in 2017 that the best approach would be to procure via RFP and instead of asking for all programs at once, the State chose to limit this RFP to Medicaid and CHIP eligibility.</p>
----	-------------------------	------------	---------------	---	--



89	1.0 General Information	1.13 Proprietary Information page 10	Clarification	This section indicates that “[t]he proposal of the successful Service Provider becomes public information.’ Can you please advise what happens to the proposal of unsuccessful Service Providers?	Unsuccessful proposals are retained for 6 years for records retention but are NOT subject to SD open records laws.
90	1.0 General Information	1.14 Length of Contract page 10	Contract term clarification	Section 1.14 indicates that contract years “will coincide with State fiscal years (which begin on July 1); however the initial contract start date for this Project is anticipated to Start on April 1, 2019 which will result in a slightly shorter initial first year contract period.” Does this mean contract year one will be April 1, 2019 until June 30 <sup>th</sup> , 2019, with the base six year term expiring then on June 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2025?	As planned the 6 initial contract years would run only until June 30, 2024...with year one only spanning April 2019 to June 2019. The State will move year 1 to cover the period May 1, 2019 through May 31, 2020. This will enable the base 6 year term to expire on May 31, 2025.
91	1.0 General Information	1.4 Schedule of activities Page 7	Alternative	Based on our experience supporting Eligibility and Enrollment request for response solicitations the standard RFP response time is generally 12 weeks, would the State please consider extending the response timeline by 4 weeks?	Please see the response to Question # 5. The State has extended the due date to October 9, 2018 at 5pm Central.
92	3.0 Background	3.2 Customers Eligible for Medical Assistance, Page 12	Additional Information	Item 3.2.2 reads: “To date, the State has not pursued Medicaid expansion, so the population eligible for Medicaid/CHIP remains essentially the same as before enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA – now referred to as the ACA). There is, however, no guarantee that the population will not change, or change materially, during the Term.” Does the State have an estimate that it can share of the population change should Medicaid expansion be implemented?	South Dakota has no plan to expand Medicaid.

93	3.0 Background	3.5 BIT	Additional Information	3.5.3 The State plans to gradually replace the complete Legacy System, but there is no assurance that this will occur and, if it occurs, there is no assurance as to when this will occur. Would the initial Go-Live include the establishment of all interfaces to the Legacy Applications?	Yes. Several Optional programs (SNAP, Child Support, and TANF) rely on some of the data from the Medicaid eligibility system today. We expect that there will be at least 1 nightly interface from the new system to the legacy system to provide this data such that the Optional programs can continue to receive the data they need.
94	3.0 Background	3.5 BIT Page 17	Additional Information	3.6.1.7 The Legacy System has limitations (the "Legacy System Limitations") What are the core legacy applications being referred to in this statement?	Most if not all areas of the Mainframe that support both Covered programs and Optional programs described in this RFP. For the Covered programs it refers to ACCESS and SS-09.
95	3.0 Background	Figure 1 As-Is Eligibility & Enrollment Environment – Medicaid\C HIP on Page 16	Additional Information	File Director is illustrated in the diagram, but no information is given regarding its capabilities. Can you describe the capabilities that File Director would provide to the overall IE solution? Some capability examples may include: Document Scanning & Imaging, Document Recognition (e.g. OCR, ICR, Bar Code), Document Storage, Document Workflow (e.g. review, edit, comment), and others.	The State is interested in obtaining an already operational solution in another state and we assume that includes a document management system like File Director. The State does not anticipate keeping the current File Director product as a part of our modern solution and is looking for the Service Provider to bid what they currently use. Current File Director capabilities include document scanning and imaging, document recognition (OCR, Bar Code), Document Storage, Document Workflow, and web service access (read/write) via http or https.

96	4.0 Scope of Work	4.1 Provision of E&E System, Page 18	Additional Information	Item 4.1.2.11 reads in part, “[The system should” [b]e sufficiently robust and flexible to handle the changing volumes of EABS and other State workers simultaneously using the System, and changing volumes of transactions including information requests, applications, documents requested, documents submitted, enrollments and the like without any degradation in performance.” Does the State have any estimates of potential volume changes or number of State workers who will access the system?	The State does not expect significant volume change for State workers over the life of this contract. Please refer to the RFP for the estimated number of State Staff who will use the system.
97	4.0 Scope of Work	4.1 Provision of E&E System, Page 19	Additional Information	Item 4.1.2.21 reads, “Be sufficiently flexible for Service Provider, and other competent with service providers, to implement future policy and program requirements by means of configuration and without any significant development efforts.” What are the expected future policy and program requirements? Please define the phrase, ‘significant development efforts’.	The State has no future policy and program requirements currently to share. The purpose of this statement is to indicate the need to have a flexible system that can be easily updated/configured. An example of Significant development would be anything that cannot be accomplished via a configuration change or table change by a super user.
98	4.0 Scope of Work	4.1 Provision of E&E System, Page 18	Clarification	Item 4.1.2.27 reads, “Provide single user interfaces for EABS, other State workers as well as customers;” however Item 4.1.2.28 reads, “Contain a Customer Portal.” It has been our experience that the needs for interfacing with an E&E system requires differently configured portals for Customers and State workers, which would lead to a contradiction between items 4.1.2.27 and 4.1.2.28. Can the State clarify its expectations with regard to these two items?	The requirements in 4.1.2.27 apply to the single user interface for EA staff and other State workers. The State understands and expects that there will be a separate user interface for recipients accessing the system via the Customer Portal. The State is asking for a single user interface for EABS and State workers AND a separate user interface via the Customer Portal for customers as discussed in 4.1.2.28.

99	4.0 Scope of Work	4.4 Project Initiating and Planning, Page 27	Clarification	Item 4.4.2.13 lists as a Service Provider Responsibility "Training materials for use of [Electronic Project Library] EPL." Our experience has been that the State's EPL is used. Please clarify whether this would be the case or if the expectation is that the Service Provider will provide the EPL.	A SharePoint site can be provided by the State that would be accessible to the State and Vendor staff.
100	4.0 Scope of Work	4.6 Design and Process Changes, Page 30	Alternative	Item 4.6.1.12 reads, "Unless otherwise specifically agreed by the State in the Master Project Schedule, most if not all of the work described in Section 4.6.1 and Section 4.6.2 shall be completed during the six-month period beginning on the Effective Date, without regard to the agreed SDLC." This potentially conflicts with the spirit of the SDLC process and could lead to dual and contradictory timelines. We suggest that the State consider allowing the work and deliverables in Sections 4.6.1 and 4.6.2 to be an integral part of the overall process, by deleting the phrase "without regard to SDLC."	RFP requirement 4.6.1.12 clearly states that "unless otherwise specifically agreed by the State in the Master Project Schedule, most if not all of the work in 4.6.1 and section 4.6.2 shall be completed during the 6 month period ...." The Service Provider can make the case during the project initiation phase, when presenting their SDLC and overall Master Project Plan and schedule, what the appropriate timeframe should be for Design activities as long as the overall timeline for implementation is no longer than 21 months AND the State is given a minimum UAT testing timeframe articulated in the RFP. Again, the RFP indicates that the State believes the activities required in any of the tasks/phases should take the amount of time indicated, but the State is expecting the service provider to propose the least risky, least costly approach and timeline for all tasks.

101	4.0 Scope of Work	4.9 Testing Activities, Page 34	Additional Information	As a Service Provider Responsibility, Item 4.9.1.1.9 reads, "Include in the Test Plan a requirement that real State data converted and formatted for the E&E System be used unless otherwise agreed by the State;". We suggest that the State add that PHI/PII be distinguished as necessary to conform with the various policies and regulations to which PHI/PII is subject.	The State agrees with this suggestion and has updated the language in Amendment #1.
102	4.0 Scope of Work	4.13 Maintenance and Operation Activities, Page 42	Clarification	Item 4.13.1.17 reads, "Permit the State to and provide the State such assistance as it may reasonably request with respect to up to two security audits and vulnerability assessments in each Contract Year." Will the State clarify that it will perform or arrange with a third party at its expense to perform these audits (this is not in the list of Retained Responsibilities on Page 44). Also, does the State consider our third-party audits to be sufficient in lieu of a State audit?	As envisioned, the State will perform or will hire a third party contractor to perform the security audits and vulnerability assessments mentioned in this requirement. The Service provider (with input from the State) will be responsible for performing the annual self-assessment and attestation that is required by the ACA using the MARS-E suite of security documents.
103	4.0 Scope of Work	4.7.1 page 31	Clarification	We understand that the State is prohibiting the use of any Off-Shore Resources in support of the project. Understanding that certain data, such as FTI, is prohibited from being off-shore, where other data is not prohibited from being off-shore, would state reconsider this position and allow for non-production or non-regulated data to be off-shore?	State and End User Data must be stored in locations under jurisdiction of US Law. The State will not change its position on the use of Off Shore Resources for any part of this project.

104	4.0 Scope of Work	Section 4.10 Training activities page 36	Clarification	Section 4.10 outlines training requirements. Can the State advise how much in person trainings it may reasonably request prior to UAT? Will the in person training all be within the capital/Pierre location? What is the maximum number of State personnel that will attend the in person sessions? Will training guides and online tutorials have to be accessible for any users with special needs?	Specific to Training required for UAT - the State envisions 1 training session prior to UAT occurring in Pierre, SD. The Service provider should expect to train no more than 25 people. The State does not anticipate the need for online tutorials to have to be accessible for users with special needs.
105	4.0 Scope of Work	4.1 Provision of E&E System Page 19	Additional Information	4.1.2.22 Have configurable application modules and domain modules (enterprise framework) and /or open source modules that need minimal customization and must meet the needs of the business functions (e.g., business rules engine, workflow, imaging, etc.) for all required human service applications Does this include the State's Legacy applications? Does the State currently have an Imaging application?	The Legacy system is a mainframe system. The Service provider will not be integrating the new E&E system with the legacy solution other than via either a real-time/near real time or batch interface to provide necessary data from the new system to support the "Optional" programs that remain on the legacy solution. The Legacy solution does not have a rules engine, nor does it utilize a work flow tool. The current legacy solution does connect to the States imaging solution, File Director on a limited basis. There are two instances where there is connectivity 1). The automated online application where uploaded documents are tied to the appropriate case and then stored in File Director and 2). Incoming applications from them FFM received via Account Transfer.

106	4.0 Scope of Work	4.4 Project Initiation and Planning Page 26	Additional Information	4.4.1.9.7 Include a Written Deliverable Expectation Document (“DED”) for each Written Deliverable designated in the Master Project Plan and Schedule as a “Milestone Written Deliverable”. Does this include integration with the State Legacy Applications?	Deliverable Expectation Documents are "preview" documents for the State to review and approve prior to the Service provider re-using and editing an existing document from the other State you have proposed the solution from OR from creating a new deliverable. DEDs are not related to the state legacy applications we are unclear of the intent of this question.
107	4.0 Scope of Work	4.7 Configurati on and Developme nt Activities  Page 31	Additional Information	4.7.3.4 Engage in Legacy System design and development activities, as needed  Will State be responsible for Maintenance & Operation of the Legacy Applications prior to the initial Go-Live?	Yes, the State will continue to maintain and operate the legacy solution prior to initial go live of the new E&E system.
108	4.0 Scope of Work	4.13 Maintenanc e and Operation Activities, Page 40	Additional Information	4.13.1.22 Maintain and keep current all system and user documentation, updating such documentation as promptly as possible following the occurrence of an event giving rise to need for an update (e.g., a system change)  We assume that this does not include the Legacy Application. Please confirm.	You are correct, this requirement does not apply to the legacy application.

109	4.0 Scope of Work	Attachment F – Non-Functional Requirements Matrix	Clarification	<p>4.18 The system shall, at a minimum, provide a mechanism to comply with security requirements and safeguard requirements of the following agencies/entities: NIST 800-53r4, MARS-E and DOD 8500.2</p> <p>Is the DOD 8500.2 requirement an RFP remnant that should be removed? If there is a DoD 8500.2 requirement please provide further instruction and guidance how the awarded Service Provider will be measured for compliance with this instruction.</p>	This is an error and the RFP will be amended to remove DOD 8500.2 as a reference security requirement. DOD 8500.2 has not been a part of any ACA Security audits and will be deleted.
110	4.0 Scope of Work	4.1.2.22 Configuration	Alternative	<p>“The State has defined “Out of Box” as “no configuration or modification or customization required by prospective service provider /State”. In light of the fact that the very nature of the State requirements will require some configuration, modification or customization, will the State consider modifying the definition to allow more bidders to propose their Commercial of the Shelf solution as an “Out of the Box” solution? In other words, can the definition be revised to state: “Out of the box indicates minimal configuration or modification or customization required by prospective service providers/State?”</p>	As used in the RFP, Section 4.1.2.22 , the term "out of the box" means that the proposed system, operating already in another State, can be minimally configured to meet South Dakota State Plan, State Law, FPL levels, and eligibility programs. True uncustomized (for any State) COTs products that have not been implemented already in another State are not desired. We acknowledge that any solution proposed, even those operating in another State will require minimal configuration and limited customization to meet our specific State plan requirements and coverage programs. The RFP will be amended (either in Attachment E or is this specific section - or both) to clarify what the State is looking for and how Attachment E should be responded to by Service providers.



111	5.0 Minimum Qualifications to Bid, Response Requirements and Bid Options	5.1 Minimum Qualifications, Page 45	Alternative	<p>The RFP includes three (3) mandatory minimum qualifications in Section 5.1 of the RFP that require the bidder to have an enrollment and eligibility solution that is operational in at least one state or U.S. territory with respect to the Covered Programs by the time the contract is executed: See Sections 5.1.3, 5.1.4 and 5.1.7.5. On the other hand, the RFP also permits bidders to propose and describe an “out of the box” solution, where the “out of the box solution” is not required to be operational in at least one state or U.S. territory with respect to the Covered Programs by the time the contract is executed: See Sections 5.2.2 and 5.2.17. Similar flexibility is found in Section 1.1 where a bidder may propose an E&amp;E system that is not operational in at least one state, etc. where it is “otherwise in the State’s best interests”. When viewed together, these RFP provisions produce two (2) unintended and potentially dangerous results for the State:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The RFP provisions are inconsistent and conflict with each other. As a result, the State may not be able to choose a bidder whose solution has not been operational in at least one state or U.S. territory by the time the contract is executed but that on balance is in the State’s best interests.</li> <li>2. Even more important, existing Enrollment and Eligibility solutions may be operational in at least one state or U.S. territory with respect to the Covered Programs but many states are finding that those operational solutions are based upon outdated technology that commits them to closed proprietary</li> </ol>	<p>The State is looking for an operational solution in another State. We did not intend to enable vendors to bid "off the shelf" untested solutions and meet the minimum requirements and the RFP will be amended to clarify this. The State will allow vendors to bid their existing solution that is either already operational and certified in another State OR will be certified and operational in another State in accordance with section 5.1 of the RFP.</p>
-----	---	---	-------------	---	---

				<p>systems that will not accommodate changing program needs other than through change requests. Retaining the minimum qualifications as currently written will unnecessarily limit competition to a small set of vendors.</p> <p>In order to avoid these two unintended effects, would the State amend the minimum qualifications in Section 5.1 so that the following language is added: such that “5.1.7.8 if a bidder proposes an out of the box solution that while not operational in another state, still is in the State’s best interests, such a bidder would be deemed to have met the minimum qualifications in Sections 5.1.3, 5.1.4 and 5.1.7.5?”</p>	
112	9.0 Cost Proposal	9.3 Page 58 and	Additional Information	<p>Section 9.0 states that “The Cost proposal for the Implementation Cost will be weighted to reflect the estimated costs to the State.” What percentage of the Total Points will be allocated to Price compared to the remainder of the proposal? Also, please provide the scoring breakdown by section.</p>	<p>RFP section 8.4.1 provides all of the evaluation categories that the State team will score in their order of importance. The State will not provide any further breakdown of points.</p>

113	Attachment E – Functional Requirements Matrix	Person Master Index, Page 84	Additional Information	Item PMI 1 reads, “The system shall include a Person Master Index (PMI) that interfaces with multiple systems, or reuse the State's PMI.” Please describe the State’s current Person Master Index?	The State would like the Service provider to describe the current solutions PMI record and how they would communicate with the Legacy solutions PMI record to ensure we keep unique member records. We do not want to re-use the current PMI in the legacy solution and the RFP will be amended accordingly.
114	Attachment E – Functional Requirements Matrix	Customer Portal, Pages 86 and 88	Clarification	Item CP 10, Page 86, reads, “The system shall require customers to establish their identity when creating an account. This will include using an identity proofing service” while Item CP 27, Page 88, reads, “The system shall be able to use the FFM/FDSH's identify proofing service for establishing customer identity.” Given that applicants / recipients might not use the FFM, are these two identity proofing steps separate or would the State prefer that either be used to establish identity as appropriate?	CMS requires all customer portals to use the Federal Data Services Hub (FDSH) identity proofing service. These requirements are referencing the same thing.
115	Attachment E – Functional Requirements Matrix	Verifications, Page 98	Clarification	Item V13, Page 98, reads, “The system shall allow staff to view Income Eligibility Verification System (IEVS) hits and capture activity taken as a result of the hit, as appropriate.” Would the State further clarify its definition of a “hit”?	A "hit" is a match between our database of recipients and what is contained in the IEVS interface.

116	Attachment E – Functional Requirements Matrix	Verifications, Page 98	Clarification	Item V15, Page 98, reads, “The system shall collect monthly income information only for Customers that do not fall into the Advanced Premium Tax Credit (APTC) income range.” Would the State clarify that this information collection applies only with respect to Verification Systems and the Verification Process? We expect that applicants would have already provided income information on their application, prior to the Verification Process.	Yes. It applies to the Verification systems at the FDSH and is a part of the verification process.
117	Attachment E – Functional Requirements Matrix	Notifications and Correspondence, Page 123	Clarification	Item NC 21, Page 123, reads, “The system shall notify staff and create auto-narrative when new customer correspondence has been received.” Can the State provide its definition of “auto-narrative”?	Auto-narrative in this example refers to the system being able to add a note to the case automatically when correspondence is logged into the system or scanned and associated with the case. The Auto narrative would indicate date of receipt and type of correspondence. Attachment E is provided for the State to assess what capabilities your current system already has in place. We will be using the solution virtually "as is" and do not expect or request that vendors develop auto narrative capability if it doesn't already exist.
118	Attachment E – Functional Requirements Matrix	Provider and Vendor Information, Page 136	Additional Information	The comment for Item PVI 1, Page 136, “The system shall allow providers and vendors to submit W-9s through various methods including but not limited to: online, paper, or electronic interface,” reads, “This function is not done through the existing ACCESS system today.” Can the State briefly describe the existing process?	The legacy solution is based on manual, paper based, processes with minimal automation. Today’s process is manual and the State does not wish to recreate the current process.

119	Attachment E – Functional Requirements Matrix	General, Page 139	Additional Information	Item G1, Page 139, reads, “The system shall allow staff the ability to create and test scenarios and cases in multiple test regions that mimic production.” We interpret this as scenarios and cases of various types related to programs the State administers. Can the State confirm this assumption and provide examples of what might be considered?	The state is looking for test region(s) that are virtually equivalent to the production environment. Your interpretation of the scenarios and cases is correct.
120	Attachment E – Functional Requirements Matrix	EBT Cards, Page 140	Additional Information	Item EBT 18, Page 140, reads, “The system shall be able to accept a monthly file of all expungements from the EBT contractor using a benefit-level expungement process.” Can the State briefly describe the role of the EBT contractor?	The EBT vendor provides transaction processing through existing commercial infrastructure supporting POS devices and operates in conformance with federal regulations, applicable national standards, and the States’ performance expectations. The core EBT services include account creation/management; benefit posting and maintenance; card production and issuance; training; transaction processing; customer services through customer service representatives, Audio Response Unit (ARU’s) and cardholder and retailer portals; retailer management, settlement and reconciliation; and management and system reporting. In addition, they provide financial/payment ACH services for our non-EBT programs. For this RFP, the EBT vendor creates the Medicaid cards and service providers must be able to interface with the vendor. All other services listed are for the Optional programs (SNAP).

121	Attachment E – Functional Requirements Matrix	Interfaces, Page 148	Additional Information	Item INT 33, Page 148, reads, “The system shall have the ability to interface with the SAVE system.” Would the State provide additional detailed information on the SAVE system and the integration options?	For the Covered programs (Medicaid/CHIP), the System must use the Verify Lawful Presence (VLP) Federal Data Services Hub verification service that accesses the SAVE system. Currently Federal rules do not allow the State to access this service for the Optional programs (SNAP, TANF, Child Care, LIEAP) and South Dakota has direct access via SAVE Web Portal to the SAVE system to support those programs. There is no interface.
122	Attachment F – Non Functional Requirements	Hosting Page 171	Alternative	Item HOST 3 Page 177 reads, “The contractor shall ensure that the solution is hosted in a Tier IV data center.” As discussed in Attachment B Cost Drivers and Project Risk response, this requirement adds significant cost for compliance while yielding very little true benefit to the State compared to a Tier 3 data center. Would the State consider changing this requirement here and wherever specified in the RFP to read “Tier 3 data center?”	The State will amend the RFP to require Tier III or greater data center.
123	Attachment K - State of South Dakota, Department of Social Services Contract Template	9. Intellectual Property, Page 215	Clarification	Item 9.2.1 has a reference error: “Except as specifically set forth in Section <b>Error! Reference source not found.</b> , the State shall not use...” Please provide the Section reference for clarity.	Please see the WORD version of the RFP that was posted. Apparently during conversion to PDF, ERROR! Appears for any referenced section in the contract.
124	Attachment K - State of South Dakota, Department of Social Services	10. Safeguarding of Data and Confidentiality, Page 216	Clarification	Please confirm that there is no Item 10.2.	This is an extra number in the Draft Contract and will be corrected in Amendment #1 with a statement - "intentionally left blank" to preserve current numbering.

	Contract Template				
125	Attachment K - State of South Dakota, Department of Social Services Contract Template	10. Safeguarding of Data and Confidentiality, Page 218	Clarification	Item 10.4.2 has a reference error: “(d) the entity agrees in writing to assume and fully comply with the obligations described in Section Error! Reference source not found.” Please provide the Section reference for clarity.	Please see the WORD version of the RFP that was posted.
126	Attachment K - State of South Dakota, Department of Social Services Contract Template	13. Audits, Page 225	Alternative	Item 13.3.2.2 states, “Without limiting the generality of Section 13.2.1, in connection with the exercise of its rights under such Section, the State may interview any Service Provider Personnel.” Might the State consider verbiage limiting this to only Service Provider Personnel who are actively involved in the execution of the contract?	The State will revise the RFP to say "Service Provider Personnel who are or were involved in the execution of the contract.

127	Attachment K – Schedule B – Key Performance Indicators and Service Level Agreement	4 Service Levels and Service Level Credits	Alternative	<p>In Section 4.1 it states “The State may change the Key Performance Indicators to which it allocates Weighting Factor Percentage Points and the number of Weighting Factor Percentage Points allocated by providing written notice to Service Provider with each change effective on the first (1st) day of the first (1st) calendar month that begins sixty (60) or more days after the date the notice is given. The State may give two such notices in any Contract Year, although there shall be no limit on the number of changes made in any one notice. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the State may not give notice prior to the first quarter of the second Contract Year. Subject to the provisions of this Section 4, the State may designate Weighting Factor Percentage Points, and change such designations, in its sole discretion.” Would the State consider modifying the language to mutually agree upon KPIs with input from both sides throughout the term of the contract? Additionally, would the state allow vendors to propose KPIs for the State to review to allow vendors to put their best pricing forward from the outset and explain the rationale for setting the KPIs at the levels they suggest?</p>	<p>RFP Attachments K and K-1 constitute the State’s required contract provisions for this project. While the following items listed below are also mandatory contract elements, the dollar amounts, and percentages represent the states preferred amounts. Vendors that wish to propose alternatives to only the following preferred dollar or percentage amounts should identify those alternatives clearly in its response. Vendor alternatives proposed may or may not be accepted by the state.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Attachment K: DSS Purchase of Services Agreement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Section 11.3.3 and 11.3.4 – Table 2 Certain Credits (liquidated damages);</li> <li>o Section 16 – specifically 16.2.1, 16.2.2, 16.2.4, 16.2.5 – Insurance;</li> <li>o Section 19.14.2 Letter of Credit;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Schedule B. Section 2.2 – Amount at risk;</li> <li>• Schedule B. Section 4.2 – Calculation of Service Level Credits;</li> <li>• Schedule B Section 7.0 Key Performance Indicators; and</li> <li>• Schedule C – Sections 22.1 and 23.3.1 – Payment Based Milestones and Holdback Percentage.</li> </ul>
128	Attachment K – Schedule D – Governance	26. Meetings, Page 261	Clarification	<p>Item 26.2.2 has a reference error: “Remediation Plans to address delays hurdles and issues raised under Section Error! Reference source not found. and...” Please provide the Section reference for clarity.</p>	<p>Please see the WORD version of the RFP posted on the DSS webpage.</p>



129	7.3 Proposal Organization	7.3.3.3 E&E System Requirements AND 7.4 Minimum Qualifications to Bid, Response Requirements and Bid Options.	Clarification for Attachment E and F	<p>Can the state please clarify in which section below Vendors include Attachments E and F, section 7.3.3.3 or 7.4, as they are requested in both sections:</p> <p>Section 7.3.3.3 indicates “Prospective service providers must also review and respond to each of the Functional and Non-Functional Requirements for the Covered Programs in Attachments E and F, an....”</p> <p>Section 7.4, states vendors are to respond to all of Section 5.0. Under section 5.4 Response to Attachment E and F Required, the RFP language indicates “Prospective service providers’ responses to this Section 5.4 must include a full response to the Functional and Non-Functional Requirements Tables provided as Attachments E and F (respectively) in this RFP”.</p>	<p>The proposal should be organized according to how Section 7.3 indicates. The State does not expect service providers to respond twice to Attachments E and F even though dually referenced by both 7.3.3.3 and 7.4 (via reference to all of Section 5). Section 5.4 provides the instructions on "how" service providers should respond to Attachments E and F. As 7.3.3.3 appears prior to 7.4 in terms of how to organize your proposal, Service Providers should respond to Attachments E &amp; F there and then when responding to all of Section 5.0 - specifically 5.4 - reference the State team back to where you addressed Attachments E and F as a part of 7.3.3.3.</p>
130	7.3 Proposal Organization	7.3.3.3 E&E System Requirements 7.3.3.4 Service Provider’s Responsibilities, Service Provider Deliverables and State Responsibilities.	Clarification	<p>Can the State confirm the numbering for the following:</p> <p>7.3.3.3 E&amp;E System Requirements should be numbered 7.3.3.2.1 E&amp;E System Requirements And</p> <p>7.3.3.4 Service Provider’s Responsibilities, Service Provider Deliverables and State Responsibilities should be numbered:</p> <p>7.3.3.2.2 Service Provider’s Responsibilities, Service Provider Deliverables and State Responsibilities</p> <p>If this is incorrect, please provide sections 7.3.3.2.1 and 7.3.3.2.2.</p>	<p>Confirmed. Amendment 1 to the RFP will fix this numbering issue.</p>

131	9.0 Cost Proposal	Exhibit 9.9.4.g – Detailed Costs Operations during Maintenance and Operations Phase Page 69	Alternative	Based on other State’s RFPs, it is unusual to require bidders to provide extensive detail regarding employee salaries and fringe benefits in a fixed price bid – especially when the State is looking for a SaaS solution that is made up of primary various licensing costs. Additionally, as such information is not a mere pricing schedule, but rather part of a formula to arrive at a fixed price, would the State allow bidders to redact such information and not have it made available for public disclosure, based on the premise it would place bidders at a competitive disadvantage in the marketplace to expose confidential salary information to other vendors? Or alternatively, would the state consider removing the requirement for this type of information altogether?	The State will allow Service providers to redact individual Salary and Fringe Benefit information such that it won’t become disclosed publicly, however we cannot redact the overall bid price. The Service provider must indicate explicitly which information in this table they would like redacted.
132	Attachment K-1-A	Information Technology Security Policy Page 271	BIT Security Policy	P 271 indicates that the Information Technology Security Policy is to be reviewed by Service Providers ‘and as applicable, be in compliance with the ITSP’. Can you clarify if this is only applicable to those Service Providers that are offering Hosting Services?	ITSP would need to be reviewed by all service providers. It is not limited to those who host the E&E solution.
133	Attachment G	BIT Service Provider Technical and Security Questions page 173	Clarification	The attachment states that the questions are being asked to help BIT determine the best ways to integrate “your product with the State’s Technology infrastructure.” Can the State confirm this questionnaire then is only applicable to Service Providers that are using BIT to host the E&E solution?	Attachment G will be completed by all Service Providers submitting a proposal no matter what bid option they choose to propose. It is not limited to just those who propose to use BIT to host the E&E Solution. Some questions will be NA based on if the vendor hosts or the State hosts
134	6.0 Proposal Requirements and	6.4.2 Third Party Security Audits	Clarification	When will State enter into a Non-disclosure Agreement? As these are required for bid submission, will the State agree to execute an NDA prior to bid	Please see the answer to Question #12

	Company Qualifications	page 53		deadline?	
135	Attachments	K-1 State of South Dakota - BIT IT Contract Provisions 23. MULTIFACTOR AUTHENTICATION Page 72	Clarification	<p>The State has a requirement that the Service Provider will be required to utilize and become federated with the State of South Dakota's Active Directory, Azure Active Directory or any other Security Assertion Markup Language (SAML) authentication system owned and managed by the State for authentication and authorization.</p> <p>To meet the NIST 800-63 Rev 2 requirements will the State be operating as the Credential Service Provider (CSP) and Registration Authority (RA), thus only requiring the Service Provider to accept these credentials Could the State Verify this requirement?</p>	Yes, the State will be operating as the CSP and RA. The Service Provider will only need to accept these credentials.
136	Attachments	Attachment K-1-A Information Technology Security Policy	Clarification	<p>The data classification system section has a FIPS 199 table, then a statement that PII, FERPA, PHI, FI, HIPAA, and etc. data is highly confidential. Is this a State classification that does not map back to FIPS 199; therefore applying NIST SP 800-60 the categorization of the E&amp;E solution is Moderate?</p>	No the E&E Solution Security Categorization is considered HIGH.

137	Attachments	Attachment E – Functional Requirements Matrix RBI 16 - The system shall allow staff to run any version of reports created, including ad hoc reports.	Additional Information	What business problem do you envision to be solved by the Ad Hoc reporting ability? The problem to be solved and the type of data (e.g. operational, temporal, golden record) will greatly influence what database repository the Ad Hoc reporting would report against. Does the State of South Dakota currently have an Enterprise Data Warehouse and do you currently provide any reporting, analytics, or ad hoc reporting against this repository?	The State does not currently have an Enterprise Data Warehouse and have very limited reporting capabilities. Keeping in mind we are asking you to bid an existing solution that is already operational in another State, the State assumes your system will have significant standard reporting capabilities but still wants the ability to run ad hoc reports on eligibility data for Covered programs that may not be a part of your standard reporting. The State routinely receives requests to report on various factors related to Medicaid and CHIP eligibles and is looking for the ability to do this in the new system --if it is a part of your existing solution from another State that you are proposing. We are not asking for development of this capability if it does not exist in your currently operational system.
138	Purpose and Contents	1.1	Budget	What is the total budget earmarked for this procurement?	The approved budget is not for public disclosure. Keeping in mind we are telling Service providers we will use their system - "As Is" with minor configuration and development, that best matches the requirements in Attachments E and F, Service providers should propose the best price they can for completing the implementation work and then maintaining and operating the solution.
139	Purpose and Contents	1.1	Budget	What is the total budget earmarked for the optional programs?	The approved budget is not for public disclosure. Keeping in mind we are telling Service providers we will use their system - "As Is" with minor configuration and development, that best matches the requirements in Attachments E and F, Service providers should propose the best price they can for completing the

					implementation work and then maintaining and operating the solution.
140	Pre-proposal Bidder's Conference	1.5	Interaction with State	As this is a complex project with many issues to discuss, would the State consider conducting individual sessions with each bidder who submits a LOI by the required due date? At a minimum, this should be a conference call.	The State will not conduct additional meetings or hold a conference. The procurement timeline is being amended to include another round of questions, related to responses posted in this document, to be due from service providers by August 31, 2018. The State will work toward answering the second round of questions by September 11, 2018. We have also extended the proposal due date to October 9, 2018. Please see State response to all questions and carefully review Amendment #1 to the RFP.
141	SCOPE OF WORK	4.12	Post - Implementation Activities/Hypercare and Warranty	We would like more clarification on Sections 4.12.1 and 4.12.2. Section 4.12.1 mentions the warranty as a possible 6 months with regard to a Go Live date. The next section, Section 4.12.2, discusses multiple rollout Go Live dates to different regions with a possible 3-month warranty. Is the entire rollout on a region by region basis presumed to be over a 6-month period? Are the rollouts presumed to be sequential, overlapping, or in parallel? How should the possible 3-month and 6-month warranties be planned for (assuming they are the later date)? Please clarify.	See the response to Question #8. The State may (but is not required) to roll out the solution as a Pilot implementation in 1 (at most 2) regions of the State. Even in the event that the solution is implemented as a Pilot, if the Pilot is deemed successful, the system will be rolled out Statewide on a State specified date. The Hypercare and Warranty period is for 6 months from the point of go live on a Statewide basis. The RFP will be amended to clarify this.
142	Data Conversion and Migration	4.8	Data Conversion	Does the State have ETL software that they want to continue to use and would it be available to the vendor to use?	The State uses SSIS. If Service Providers already have a tool, they should propose the ETL tool they are used to using.

143	Data Conversion and Migration	4.8	Data Conversion	Can the State provide information about the Legacy System that currently is used for Case Management and the ability of this system to allow connection directly from external software such as ETL?	The Legacy system is a mainframe based solution and does not have a Case management module or capability. The mainframe would be where data conversion would be occurring and the Service provider will need to work with BIT to connect the ETL tool to the appropriate database(s) needed for conversion. BIT would expect to use webMethods for external connections to the mainframe.
144	Data Conversion and Migration	4.8	Data Conversion	How does state intend to work cases requiring changes to the client's benefit due to appeals for the time period when the program was served from Legacy System and determination was created in Legacy System?	After implementation, all changes will be made in the new solution. In the scenario discussed, EA would make any adjustments to eligibility in the new solution.
145	Data Conversion and Migration	4.8	Data Conversion	Will the State be able to provide Legacy System data in the format specified by the vendor for conversion?	We assume that core pieces of information can be pulled from the legacy solution, however the data may need to be "transformed" to fit into the new systems data structures. It will depend on the service providers system. State will provide data in a mutually agreed upon format.
146	Training Activities	4.10.3.3	Training	RFP Section 4.10.3.3 states that the State is responsible for "Securing training rooms with desktop computers for use by trainees during training session." How many seats will be in the training facility and will it be in Pierre? How many State trainers will need to be trained?	The State Training will occur in Pierre. The State anticipates a room with approximately 15 - 20 desktop computers. The Service Provider should plan on training 8 State "Trainer's
147	5.0 Minimum Qualifications to Bid	5.1.4 Prospective service providers must have experience	Minimum Qualifications to Bid	Can the prospective service provider use a subcontractor's prior experience to meet this qualification?	The State does not want a solution that the vendor has no experience implementing, but we recognize that System integrators have experience that is shared between themselves and their subcontractor IT vendor who manages

		(proven by references) implementing eligibility and enrollment systems based on the same solution as the E&E System being proposed			the system. The State will amend the minimum requirements to ensure that System Integrators can reference implementations where they have implemented a subcontractors system as evidence that they meet the minimum qualifications to bid.
148	6.0 Proposal Requirements & Company Qualifications	6.3 Financial Standing	Most recent three (3) years of audited financial statements	<p>We are a privately held company with zero debt and sound financial standing with available sources of funding. We are not required to have audited financial statements.</p> <p>Will the State be willing to consider unaudited financial statements instead and other means of reducing financial risks such as bid bond, bank credit letters, holdbacks, etc. to reduce financial risks? This would insure fair competition for the RFP.</p>	The RFP required the submission of Audited Financial Statements. However, if unable to provide Audited Financial Statements, provide alternative documentation that demonstrates a strong financial position and then describe what alternative actions you will take to support the accuracy of the financial statements.

149	6.0 Financial Standing	6.3.1 Standards for Attestation Engagements Form	SSAE 16 Reports	<p>We are a privately held company with good financial standing. Usually publicly held companies are subject to SSAE 16 reporting and we are not required by law to provide SSAE 16 reports. Enforcing this condition will restrict fair competition.</p> <p>Will the State be willing to consider other ways of determining financial stability such as bank letter of credit, bid bond, etc.?</p>	Regarding the SSAE 16 if unable to provide a copy of the most recent report, explain why and whether it could be provided in the future. If not then describe other ways that the status of financial and internal controls can be conveyed to the State.
150	Proposal Expectations	9.1	Project Requirements	<p>The RFP states that “The State, with support from CMS, does not expect to pay any implementation charges for a system that already has been developed and is operational in another state beyond those costs associated with configuration for the State’s specific FPL levels, data conversion and interface development.” Does this mean that the State will be willing to adjust their policy and business processes to align with the system already developed for another state to save on design and development costs?</p>	Yes - the primary concept in this RFP is to utilize a solution that has already been implemented in another State and approved by CMS for the Covered programs discussed in this RFP. The State is committed to using the solution virtually as is and will adjust policy and processes to conform to the system. The system still must meet South Dakota law, Federal law and be able to be configured for SD FPL levels and programs.
151	Functional Requirements	Attachment E	Functional Requirements Matrix	<p>Will the State be willing to be flexible in terms of how the Attachment E requirements might be met given that that they be addressed differently in other state systems or OOTB?</p>	Yes - Attachment E represents the requirements we hope to have our system meet. The State is using Attachment E to determine what the best fit for South Dakota will be based on what Service Provider Systems already have as fully functional capabilities, partially functional or will need to be developed. We are not asking for anything in Attachment E to be developed beyond those requirements in the Interface Section and Data Conversion section.



152	Functional Requirements	Attachment E	Functional Requirements Matrix	Can the State provide the list of users and user roles that expected to access the system? For example, State Case Workers, Supervisors and Managers, Providers and Citizens.	The State envisions the following user groups: Clerical Staff, Benefit Specialists, Supervisors, Regional Managers, EA Management team, Support Staff and Super Users (for reporting and executive abilities) all within the estimated 500 users. We will provide a list of actual names to the Service Provider after contract award and prior to UAT.
153	Functional Requirements	Attachment E	Functional Requirements Matrix	Can the State provide more details about the MMIS Interface as specified in INT 37? If changes are required as part of new implementation in MMIS, does the State have staff who can make modifications to the existing system?	The State is not looking to make any changes to the MMIS daily interface. The Legacy MMIS cannot handle anything different from what it currently receives from the Legacy eligibility system. Service Provider should assume that they will be responsible for transforming their data into the existing file format and will work with BIT to ensure that the new system can send the same format of information that is sent today.
154	Functional Requirements	Attachment E	Functional Requirements Matrix	Can the vendor interpret “conciliations” as appeals or dispute resolution? If not please provide more information about what “conciliations” means in South Dakota.	Conciliations in South Dakota refers to a recipient who is out of compliance with program requirements. South Dakota considers a conciliation as an event where the recipient is out of compliance for work requirements (currently in SNAP and TANF) and prior to sanction meets with their benefits specialist to explain any reasons for non-compliance.
155	Functional Requirements	Attachment E	Functional Requirements Matrix	HOST – 2 requirements. Can we assume that the Vendor will be responsible for hosting all Development, Testing, UAT, and Staging environments and that the Production environment will be hosted by State?	Service providers need to determine which bid option they will propose. The State is NOT requiring the solution to be hosted in South Dakota.

156	Non-Functional Requirements	Attachment F	Attachment F – Non-Functional Requirements Matrix	Will the State be willing work with the vendor to determine the best and most cost-effective way to address the non-functional requirements stated in Attachment F?	Yes. Attachment F is a list of requirements we are looking for, however we are not looking for major development and cost associated with meeting those requirements. South Dakota will select the vendor most closely meeting the requirements without having to develop capability to meet the requirements. Service providers should fill out the Attachment with the appropriate answer for each question based on their current solution capabilities and anything they propose to do to meet the Non Functional requirements as a part of this proposal. Proposals should clearly describe what is included in the proposal costs.
157	Purchase Services Agreement	Attachment K	Terms & Conditions	We are interested in partnering with South Dakota for this project, but our philosophy is flexibility with our customers so that both parties' interests are met. Certain terms in Attachment J, such as Liquidated Damages, payback of FPP monies, unlimited liability for certain situations, and Service Level credits for example are difficult to accept, as is, without undue risk. Is the State willing to be flexible on these Ts & Cs in Attachment J so that we can negotiate these after award?	RFP Attachments K and K-1 constitute the State's required contract provisions for this project. While the following items listed below are also mandatory contract elements, the dollar amounts, and percentages represent the states preferred amounts. Vendors that wish to propose alternatives to only the following preferred dollar or percentage amounts should identify those alternatives clearly in its response. Vendor alternatives proposed may or may not be accepted by the state. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Attachment K: DSS Purchase of Services Agreement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Section 11.3.3 and 11.3.4 – Table 2 Certain Credits (liquidated damages);</li> <li>o Section 16 – specifically 16.2.1, 16.2.2, 16.2.4, 16.2.5 – Insurance;</li> <li>o Section 19.14.2 Letter of Credit;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Schedule B. Section 2.2 – Amount at risk;</li> <li>• Schedule B. Section 4.2 – Calculation</li> </ul>

					<p>of Service Level Credits;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedule B Section 7.0 Key Performance Indicators; and</li> <li>• Schedule C – Sections 22.1 and 23.3.1 – Payment Based Milestones and Holdback Percentage.</li> </ul>
158	General	General	Available Hardware / Software	Please provide a list of hardware and software tools that would be available for the vendor to use. How many licenses of each would be available?	Assume the State has no tools available for reuse. Hardware and Software tools that BIT has may or may not be compatible with modern solutions.
159	General	General	Business User Involvement	Please describe how the State plans to engage business users in each phase of the project lifecycle.	The State envisions a core team of EA staff supplemented by Subject Matter Experts, as needed, to participate in all of the tasks and activities of the project. This is envisioned to occur from project initiation all the way through Implementation. DSS will also have contractor staff assisting with the implementation and an IV&V vendor. The State plans to use a detailed communication plan with internal and external stakeholders throughout the life of the project to ensure staff project knowledge and engagement.
160	General	General	State Resources	What is the State's staffing plan for the project? How many full-time State resources, by position, will be assigned to the project?	The State is envision a core team of approximately 8 staff, each spending various amounts of time on the project. The State has planned to augment state staff with contractor staff to assist with Testing and other tasks.

161	General	General	Interfaces	Please provide a list of interfaces that the State expects the new E&E System to interface with.	See RFP Attachment E - INT section. All interfaces for both the Covered Programs and the Optional programs are described there. Also see response to question # 29
162	Page 10	1.14 Length of Contract	Implementation Timeframe	The RFP indicates that the implementation should take "no more than 21 months". What is the DSS' ideal timeframe for Go Live of the system?	The State set 21 months as the go live timeframe, however, depending on how mature the solution is and how well the implementation progresses - particularly with testing, the State would be willing to consider an implementation prior to 21 months.
163	Page 12	3.4 The Legacy Infrastructure and Architecture	Legacy System Stakeholders	Please provide a listing of all current stakeholders/vendors involved in the legacy system as well as other associated vendor stakeholders and their current roles.	The legacy system is maintained and operated by BIT. Deloitte provided the State with the current online application for Medicaid and they have some maintenance obligations. The State also uses an Enterprise Service Bus, Web Methods, which has some support from Software AG. There are no other external stakeholders.
164	Page 16	3.5 BIT	Hosting Preference	Does the BIT and DSS have a hosting preference (e.g., cloud vs. on premise, etc.)?	No preference however, the State believes the most cost effective hosting arrangement would be for the Service provider to work with their current state clients and have them agree to host the solution on existing infrastructure or have the Service Provider host the system if that is where it is already located.
165	Page 58	9.0 Cost Proposal	Budget	What is the current or anticipated budget for this project?	The budget is not for public disclosure. As the RFP indicates, the State does not intend to pay for development costs for a solution that we are taking "virtually" as is from another State. Service providers should propose their best price for South Dakota and clearly articulate what is and is NOT included in the price.

166	Page 179	Question #B8	FedRAMP	Does the BIT and DSS prefer hosting compliant with the FedRAMP high baseline/impact level, or is the moderate baseline acceptable?	The Service Provider Technical and Security Questions are an information gathering tool to understand vendor solutions. BIT does not have a preference.
-----	----------	--------------	---------	--	---